

Application No. 10/705,591  
Response dated: August 31, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of June 1, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 31 2006

### REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated June 1, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present Application for consideration upon entry of the following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments is at least found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kaminsky et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,898,012, (hereinafter "Kaminsky"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1 recites:

A reflector for a back light assembly for use in an LCD device, comprising:  
a base film;  
a protrusion provided on a first surface of the base film, the first surface being substantially flat; and  
a reflecting layer deposited on the first surface of the base film and the protrusion, for reflecting light generated from a lamp.

In the Office Action, base 20, major/minor/intricate/simple lenses 22/24/30/32 and aluminum coating 34 of Kaminsky are considered as disclosing the base film, protrusion and reflecting layer, respectively, of the claimed invention. In an illustration provided in the Office

SWO-0002  
PL0002/US

Page 5 of 8.

Application No. 10/705,591  
Response dated: August 31, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of June 1, 2006

Action, the Examiner also indicates that the boundary between the base 20 the lenses 22/24/30/32 is being considered the first surface. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Kaminsky discloses minor lenses 24 on the surface of the major lenses 22 which are applied to base 20. (Col. 17, lines 56-65 and Figure 1.) Intricate complex lens 30 and simpler complex lens 32 are collections of the minor and major lenses 24 and 22 in varying height to width ratios. (*Id.*) As specifically disclosed by Kaminsky, the aluminum coating 34 is *applied to the surface of the complex lenses 30 and 32*. (Col. 18, lines 1-5 and Figure 1.) Figure 1 shows the aluminum coating 34 disposed only along the profile of the lenses 22/24/30/32. That is, the aluminum coating 34 is not disposed on any part of the base 20, let alone the surface 26 of the base 20. Therefore, Kaminsky does not disclose a reflecting layer deposited on the first surface of the base film and the protrusion of Claim 1.

In a non-limiting exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, the reflecting layer 75 is formed on the surface of the protrusions 73 and the remaining surface of the base film 71 where no protrusion is formed. (See, page 7, lines 19-24 and FIG. 2 of the Specification.) That is, the reflecting layer 75 is clearly on the base film 71. As discussed above, the aluminum coating 34 of Kaminsky cannot be considered "on the first surface of the base film" as claimed. To the contrary, Kaminsky only discloses the aluminum coating applied to the surface of the complex lenses. Therefore, Kaminsky further does not disclose a reflecting layer deposited on the first surface of the base film and the protrusion of Claim 1.

Thus, Kaminsky fails to disclose all of the limitations of Claim 1 and does not anticipate Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is not further rejected or objected and is therefore allowable. Claims 2, 3, 5 and 9 variously depend from Claim 1 and are correspondingly allowable. Reconsideration, withdrawal of the relevant rejections and allowance of Claims 1-3, 5 and 9 are respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art and that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention,

Application No. 10/705,591  
Response dated: August 31, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of June 1, 2006

must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaminsky in view of previously cited Sinkoff, U.S. Patent 6,724,529 (hereinafter "Sinkoff").

Claims 6-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaminsky in view of previously cited Yang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,151,089 (hereinafter "Yang").

Claims 10-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaminsky in view of previously cited Hira et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,961,198 (hereinafter "Hira"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 4, 6-8 and 10-20 variously depend from Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable over Kaminsky. Claims 4, 6-8, 10-20 variously depend from Claim 1 and inherit all of the limitations of Claim 1. Sinkoff, Yang and Hira do not disclose a reflecting layer deposited on the first surface of the base film and the protrusion of Claim 1 and do not remedy the deficiencies of Kaminsky.

Thus, Kaminsky, Sinkoff, Yang and Hira, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 4, 6-8, 10-20. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4, 6-8, 10-20 are not further rejected or objected and are therefore allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 4, 6-8, 10-20 are respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

All of the rejections are herein overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. No new matter is added by way of the present Amendments and Remarks, as support is found throughout the original filed specification, claims and drawings. Prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

SWO-0002  
PL0002/US

Page 7 of 8.

Application No. 10/705,591  
Response dated: August 31, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action of June 1, 2006

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the below listed phone number regarding this response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Applicants hereby petition for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

If there are any charges due with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Amy Bizon-Copp  
Amy Bizon-Copp  
Reg. No. 53,993  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: August 31, 2006

SWO-0002  
PL0002/US

Page 8 of 8.